

August 3, 2004

**MINUTES OF AN ADJOURNED REGULAR
MEETING OF THE TORRANCE CITY COUNCIL**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Torrance City Council convened in an adjourned regular meeting at 5:32 p.m. on August 3, 2004, in Council Chambers.

ROLL CALL

Present: Councilmembers Lieu, Nowatka, Mauno, McIntyre, Scotto, Witkowsky and Mayor Walker.

Absent: None.

Also Present: City Manager Jackson, City Attorney Fellows, City Clerk Herbers and other staff representatives.

17. EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Council immediately recessed to closed session to confer with the City Manager and the City Attorney on the agenda matters listed under 17.a) Conference with Legal Counsel – Newly Filed Federal Lawsuit and 17.b) Real Property – Conference with Real Property Negotiator pursuant to California Government Code Sections 54956.9(a) and 54956.8.

The City Council reconvened at 6:05 p.m.

2. FLAG SALUTE/INVOCATION

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilmember Lieu.

The invocation was given by Councilmember Witkowsky.

3. AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING/WAIVE FURTHER READING

MOTION: Councilmember Scotto moved to accept and file the report of the City Clerk on the posting of the agenda for this meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McIntyre and a voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

MOTION: Councilmember Scotto moved that after the City Clerk has read aloud the number and title to any resolution or ordinance on the meeting agenda, the further reading thereof shall be waived, reserving and guaranteeing to each Councilmember the right to demand the reading of any such resolution or ordinance in regular order. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McIntyre and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval.

4. WITHDRAWN OR DEFERRED ITEMS

None.

5. COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Fire Chief Bongard reminded everyone that the Exxon/Mobil Torrance Refinery Monthly Community Alert Siren Testing would take place on Wednesday, August 4, 2004 at approximately 11:30 a.m.

Councilmember Nowatka announced that the next Ad Hoc Legislative Committee meeting would be Tuesday, August 24 at 4:30 p.m. in the Third Floor Assembly room to consider ballot measures on the November ballot.

Councilmember Witkowsky announced that the Community Planning and Design Committee would be meeting on Monday, August 23 at 3:30 p.m. in the Third Floor Assembly room to discuss the Mills Act – Overlay District.

City Clerk Herbers noted that Mr. Tatsuhiko Wakao and Mr. Shintaro Shino of the Kansai Club had brought visiting university students from Japan, China and Korea to the meeting to see how democracy works in the United States.

6. COMMUNITY MATTERS

6a. WORKFORCE INVESTMENT NETWORK BOARD MEMBERS

Recommendation of the Workforce Investment Network Policy Board that City Council appoint and officially swear in the City of Torrance members of Carson/Lomita/Torrance Workforce Investment Network (C/L/T WiN) Board.

Councilmember Nowatka indicated that WiN tried to provide businesses with employees that can do the job and find jobs for people who need them and he observed that they administer many programs and there have been many cuts in the budget.

Councilmember Nowatka recommended appointment for Clark Adams, Michael Kraemer, Teri Morales, Kurt Weidman, Richard Slawson, Pat Caldwell, Elizabeth Nash and Elaine Winer and he recognized leaving members Scott Gobble with Southern California Edison and Joe Aro with the South Bay Economic Development Partnership for their service to WiN.

MOTION: Councilmember Nowatka moved to appoint Clark Adams, Michael Kraemer, Teri Morales, Kurt Weidman, Richard Slawson, Pat Caldwell, Elizabeth Nash and Elaine Winer to the WiN Board. Councilmember Witkowsky seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval.

City Clerk Herbers swore in those Board members who were present.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember Nowatka asked that item 7a be pulled out for separate consideration on behalf of an audience member.

7a. FINAL TRACT MAP NO. 53988 – 23747 ARLINGTON AVENUE

Recommendation of the Community Development Director that City Council approve Final Tract Map No. 53988 (8 condominium units on one lot), located at 23747 Arlington Avenue, which substantially conforms to and meets all conditions of approval of the Tentative Map.

7b. MULTI-AGENCY MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT RE URBAN STORMWATER

Recommendation

Recommendation of the Urban Stormwater Committee that City Council:

- 1) Approve the multi-agency Memorandum of Agreement between the cities of Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, El Segundo, the County of Los Angeles, and Caltrans, for a term ending on January 15, 2006

for the development of an Implementation Plan required by stormwater regulations; and

- 2) Authorize an expenditure in the amount of \$52,350 for said agreement from funds currently appropriated to the Fiscal Year 2004/2005 NPDES Operating Budget.

7c. RENEWAL VENDOR CONTRACT RE NEPTUNE BRAND WATER METERS

Recommendation

Recommendation of the General Services Director and the Acting Public Works Director that City Council authorize the renewal of a vendor contract with Neptune Technology Group of Tallassee, AL for the purchase of Neptune brand water meters on an "as needed basis". Total expenditure will not exceed \$110,000 and renewal of the contract will extend the expiration date to June 30, 2005.

7d. PURCHASE ORDER RE READY MIX CONCRETE CLASS "A" AND CLASS "C"

Recommendation

Recommendation of the Acting Public Works Director that City Council authorize a purchase order with A & A Ready Mixed Concrete, Inc. of Newport Beach, CA, in the amount of \$454,620 for ready mix concrete, class "A", class "C" and slurry mix, on an as needed basis for a two (2) year period. (B2004-26)

7e. SECOND AMENDMENT TO CONSULTING SERVICES AGREEMENT RE DOWNTOWN SANITARY SEWER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM

Recommendation

Recommendation of the Acting Public Works Director that City Council:

- 1) Approve a second amendment to consulting services agreement with Boyle Engineering Corporation (C2001-176) in the amount of \$19,845 for additional engineering design services for the Downtown Sanitary Sewer Replacement Program, I-38, for a new not to exceed total of \$780,662, extend the agreement term to August 7, 2005; and
- 2) Authorize the Mayor to execute and the City Clerk to attest to said amendment.

7f. CHANGE ORDER RE RELOCATION OF WATER MAINS

Recommendation

Recommendation of the **Acting Public Works Director** that City Council:

- 1) Approve a change order in the amount of \$24,993 to public works agreement with Engineered Plumbing (C2003-201) for a new not to exceed total of \$2,386,165.40 for the relocation of water mains in conflict with the Los Angeles County Mindora Storm Drain Project; and
- 2) Authorize the Acting Public Works Director to execute said change order.

7g. AMENDMENT TO CONTACT SERVICES AGREEMENT RE EMERGENCY SEWER LINE REPAIRS

Recommendation of the Acting Public Works Director that City Council approve an amendment to contract services agreement with Doty Bros. Equipment Company of Norwalk, CA (C2003-190) for Fiscal Year 2003-2004 in the amount of \$40,000 on a time and materials basis for emergency sewer line repairs at 234th Street and Juniper Avenue, increasing the total agreement amount to \$80,000.

MOTION: Councilmember McIntyre moved to approve items 7b through 7g as written. Councilmember Witkowski seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval.

Bonnie Mae Barnard, Gramercy Avenue, received clarification that item 7a was located at the corner of 237th and Arlington and was not a new development but rather in the final stages.

MOTION: Councilmember Witkowski moved to approve item 7a as written. Councilmember McIntyre seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval.

9. PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

9a. FINAL TRACT MAP NO. 53091 – 2829 MARICOPA STREET

Recommendation of the Community Development Director that City Council:

- 1) Approve Final Tract Map No. 53091, creating a 104-unit detached condominium project on three lots, located at 2829 Maricopa Street, which substantially conforms to and meets all conditions of the approval of the Tentative Map; and
- 2) Accept a variable width easement for public waterline purposes.

Councilmember Scotto indicated that he had voted against the item and asked for clarification on the necessity of the action. City Attorney Fellows explained that it was an administrative action by the City to accept the final map that can't really be denied if it conforms which staff says that it does. He added that it could have been done by designating a city employee to accept the maps but historically it has been done by the Council.

Mayor Walker expressed concerns with regard to the developers' blatant disregard as to what was approved by the Council and what was agreed to by the owner of the development in question. He acknowledged that staff had worked out an arrangement to replace the old trees that were supposed to remain but he questioned what power they had to make sure that the replacement trees are full sized trees and will be planted in the parkway and public areas and not just inside.

Planning Manager Isomoto reported that several landscaping conditions had been applied to the tract including retaining any mature trees on site where feasible with a condition that if trees did have to be removed they had to be replaced on a two-for one basis. For the 85 trees removed the developer will have to plant over 170 trees on site with the majority planted outside the perimeter fence. There will also be some large trees in the recreation area and at the main entrance with trees planted throughout the site in front of the units. A review of the latest version of the landscape plan has not yet been completed but the developer will be compelled to provide as many trees as required.

Councilmember McIntyre noted that people in Torrance Gardens were very distressed to see 85 mature pine trees uprooted. She noticed trees in 15 gallon containers and 48 inch boxes, none of which constitute mature trees, and asked that the specifications be revisited. Planning Manager Isomoto noted that the 15 gallon trees were not proposed for the perimeter, but were for the interior on individual home sites and perimeter trees range from 24-48 inches at this point but she indicated that they would be happy to work with the developers to increase those tree sizes as well as the numbers.

Councilmember Nowatka also expressed concerns with losing those trees and cited the issue of what the new trees would look like, what kind, how large, how mature, etc. He asked staff to look at the possibility of hiring a landscaping consultant to examine those landscaping plans and look at the best alternatives for the project.

Robert Thompson, President, Madrona Homeowners Association, indicated that members had expressed disgust when they saw the mature trees being taken out and were even more concerned when they found out the City authorized the developer to cut them down. His understanding was that they would be replaced with 5 foot trees and it will be 50 years before they are mature trees. He indicated this was the last straw for them on the whole development issue throughout Torrance.

MOTION: Councilmember Witkowsky moved to accept the staff recommendation. Councilmember McIntyre seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval.

City Manager Jackson responded to the earlier suggestion by Councilmember Nowatka about hiring an arborist and Councilmember Nowatka pointed out that the arborist's recommendations were part of the decision making process that lost the trees in the first place. He asserted he wanted to look at the plans for the landscaping on the property to make sure that they are getting the best they can get to replace what was taken out. He acknowledged that they were not going to have mature trees, but wanted to make sure that those trees that are being proposed are the best choices and he wanted to know what it would look like 25 years from now. City Manager Jackson commented that it was not the normal process and asked for confirmation that the Council wanted to go in that direction.

Councilmember Witkowsky questioned whether that would lengthen the amount of time for the project and City Manager Jackson indicated that it would not but it would be a money expenditure and they could give an authorization for a certain amount of money to hire a landscape architect. He suggested they could allot \$5,000 to get an assessment in the types and scope of landscaping being proposed by the developer and Councilmember Witkowsky suggested using City staff to do that in-house and report back to Council. Mayor Walker pointed out that had already been done and he didn't see the harm in the expenditure moving forward.

City Attorney Fellows suggested bringing forward an item for next week's consideration and Councilmember Mauno proposed seeing if the costs could be passed on to the developer who caused the problem.

11. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

11a. CONTINUED STATE OF LOCAL EMERGENCY FOR CAROLWOOD LANE AND SINGINGWOOD DRIVE

Recommendation of the City Manager and the City Attorney that City Council continue the state of local emergency, proclaimed March 2, 2001 for properties located on Carolwood Lane and Singingwood Drive.

MOTION: Councilmember Scotto moved to continue the state of local emergency for Carolwood Lane and Singingwood Drive. Councilmember McIntyre seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval.

11b. RESOLUTION NOS. 2004-97-100 RE SPECIAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2004

Recommendation of the City Clerk that City Council take action relating to:

- 1) Adopting a Resolution calling a Special Municipal Election on Tuesday, November 2, 2004 for the purpose of submitting a measure to change the general municipal election date;
- 2) Adopting a Resolution requesting consolidation on the Los Angeles County General election;
- 3) Adopting optional Resolution(s) authorizing Councilmembers to file arguments and authorizing rebuttal arguments.

City Clerk Herbers noted that the change as proposed would remedy a future conflict that occurs in 2016. Currently Torrance elections are held the first Tuesday after the first Monday and the State primaries are the first Tuesday in March so there would be a conflict. The legislature has the power to change dates and there is currently legislation pending in Senator Ross Johnson's SB1730 that is not scheduled to be heard until August 4 before the Appropriations Committee. If SB 1730 goes forward to move the election to June it would extend Councilmembers terms by three months. City Clerk Herbers indicated that additional information was available in the item and supplemental information contains responses to questions she received over the last week.

Mayor Walker said he brought the item forward at the request of one of his colleagues and he felt the simplest way to start was to read what he said in his letter to the editor in the Daily Breeze this morning entitled: Combined Elections Increase Voter Turnout and Cost Less Taxpayer Money.

"Keep our City Council elections combined with the statewide municipal elections. To do this, we need to pass a charter amendment. In 2000 the City Elections were combined with the statewide primary. The Daily Breeze reported that the election had a greater voter participation and saved taxpayer money. Now the same people who wanted a city stand-alone election changed to May and spent \$90,000 of taxpayer money in an unsuccessful attempt to get their way, want us to turn the clock back. They want us to pay more taxpayer money to hold an election. They want us to have low voter turnout stand-alone elections. They want the Torrance voter to have to go to the polls twice to vote rather than once. They don't care that some city and state elections will fall within one week of each other causing mass confusion.

Keep the elections combined. The Daily Breeze said, "Torrance scored two big prizes by consolidating its local polling with state and presidential elections – more than twice as many voters turned out and the city's bill plummeted by more than two-thirds from \$180,000 in 1994 to an estimated \$57,000."

Combined elections are good for everyone. Let's stop this attempt to keep voter turnout low. Everyone should be given the widest opportunity to vote. In a Democracy you want the greatest number of voters possible. It's good government."

Councilmember Nowatka expressed concern with the comment in the Daily Breeze article that someone was trying to turn back the clock noting that he was not sure which colleague asked the Mayor to bring the issue forward but it was not him. He reported that he had asked that the item be held over to today's meeting so he could be part of the conversation and he received clarification from City Clerk Herbers that the March 2006 election will be a consolidated election. Councilmember Nowatka reiterated that if no changes are made the March 2006 election will be consolidated and he

questioned what the issue of the timing was and why there is pressure now to change the dates for something that happens in 2016.

Councilmember Nowatka observed that there would be advantages in combining elections to save money but it would also give the state control of when the elections are from now on. He pointed out that there have always been March elections and it has never before been seen as a problem.

Councilmember Nowatka reported receiving phone calls and emails pointing out that sometimes lower voter turnout is attributable to residents who are satisfied with City government and those people who come out in municipal elections take the time to make themselves knowledgeable about the election. If the election is expanded to be part of a larger process it will make it impossible for people to challenge the incumbents because of the cost of the election as incumbents have an easier time raising money than challengers do. He expressed much concern about the proposal and indicated that he would like to hear what the audience had to say.

Councilmember Scotto also questioned the urgency of the issue especially not knowing what the outcome of the voting on SB1730 would be tomorrow and he pointed out that there is no rush to make this decision right now because there would have to be a special election no matter when the change would be considered. He indicated that it would take years for the City to recoup the cost of the special election.

Councilmember Scotto asserted that his biggest problem with combining the elections is that anyone who wants to run for office has to raise twice as much money to run which will eliminate many qualified people.

Mayor Walker noted that the timing was such that the State Legislature would have a better than 50-50 chance of passing something that moves their election date. Torrance has a four year history with two elections that shows the value of combined elections in increased voter turnout, participation, interest and a huge cost savings. In 1994 with a 25% voter turn out, election costs were \$180,000 according to the Daily Breeze. In 2000 there was a 48% voter turnout at a cost of \$57,000 and in 1998 over \$100,000 was spent for a 9% voter turnout. He disagreed with the idea that low voter turnout and participation are good for government and indicated that the voters had settled the question of whether they wanted combined elections and cost savings in 1999 when Measure H was brought forward. He asserted that the same people that are objecting to spending money on this election came forth very quickly with the idea of spending \$90,000 on an election to move elections to May when the state moved their election to combine with ours. Mayor Walker added that those people talked about it not costing more money and they talk about many things but the bottom line is that the Daily Breeze reported election figures and said combining elections was one of the best things ever to happen.

Councilmember McIntyre reported that in response to her request for information, the City Clerk had compiled a document entitled "The Proposed Charter Amendment" which is a detailed run down of the elections, number of votes cast, amount spent, number of registered voters, etc., and creates a very accurate profile of elections in Torrance since 1994. She received clarification that most people in the audience had not had time to read the document and she expressed interest in hearing what the audience had to say.

Mayor Walker pointed out an error in the white document indicating 17% voter turnout for the 2000 elections when in fact it had a turnout of 54.7% and Councilmember McIntyre indicated that she and the audience were referring to the updated pink document.

Councilmember Witkowsky thanked City Clerk Herbers for providing information on absentee voting from the Board of Supervisors on coordinated issues. "When two elections are conducted separately, voters receive two sample ballots and those wishing to vote by mail must apply separately to the County and to the City for absentee ballots. When this occurred in Long Beach and other cities holding concurrent elections in the past, voters were confused. Despite the mutual exchange of absentee voter lists between the City and the County the risks of some voters failing to receive one of the two absentee ballots is increased. In past concurrent elections it was not uncommon for voters to place both City and County absentee ballots in one envelope. Because the County canvass process is twice as long as the City's, some voted absentee ballots were not discovered by the County until the City's canvass was complete." Councilmember Witkowsky found that issue disturbing and expressed interest in hearing input from the audience.

Former Mayor Dee Hardison, West 236th Street, stated that the Council was asking to call a special municipal election on November 2 to amend the City Charter to change the March general municipal election date to whenever the statewide direct primary election is held in evenly numbered years. She felt this was a bad idea as Torrance has always prided itself on local control. If the state legislature decides to change the statewide primary back to June from March that is their business. Until 1998 the state primary was in June, but that doesn't mean Torrance should change their local elections. Five years ago in 1999, the people of Torrance voted to keep City elections in March, keeping a 30 year tradition since 1974.

Former Mayor Hardison reported that Mayor Walker had campaigned to keep City elections in March and she noted that nothing has changed since then so why is it necessary to change the elections and spend City money on that. The Los Angeles County Registrar estimated it would cost Torrance \$90,000 to place the measure on the November ballot and an additional \$30,000 to notify registered voters if the measure is successful. She asserted that it was a waste of \$120,000 at a time when City services are being cut or curtailed and the money could be used instead for police, fire, paramedic services, for the parks, libraries or senior services.

Another reason she felt the consolidation was a bad idea is because Torrance has to request and receive approval from the Board of Supervisors for a consolidation to be on the Los Angeles County general election date because the county runs state wide elections. The County's own information states that on June 15 the County rejected a request from another city to change their election to coincide with the statewide primary election and there have been other requests that they have also denied, conforming to the current policy of the board. She questioned why Torrance would think that the County would say yes to Torrance and that it would be a waste of \$90,000 if the measure is placed on the November ballot and then gets denied.

Former Mayor Hardison questioned the motive of cost saving when the agenda indicates that the cost of the last local election in 1998 was \$92,000 and it will cost \$90,000 to place a single measure on the county ballot in 2004. She expressed hope that the council would not be giving up local control for a \$2,000 savings.

Former Mayor Hardison noted that the record did not substantiate a higher voter turnout. She noted that that from 1994 to 2004 in the six statewide primaries the voter turnout in the City of Torrance has only averaged 38%. In the last local municipal election

in 1994 where there were contested races there was a 25% voter turnout. She expressed hope that the City would not be giving up local control for a modest voter turnout increase.

Former Mayor Hardison questioned why the mayor was pushing to change the March election date when it is a fact that local election campaigns cost more now that they are combined with a statewide primary. She noted that in the statewide primary of 2002 the eight Torrance City Council candidates collectively spent \$200,000 on that election with the top four spending \$138,000. Three of those four top spending candidates were elected to the City Council. In the local election of 1994 Ms. Hardison reported spending \$53,000 to be elected mayor, but in the 2002 statewide election Mr. Walker spent nearly \$200,000 to be elected mayor. She believed that in the upcoming 2006 election it would be to the advantage of Mr. Walker and other incumbent councilmembers running for reelection to keep the election costs high which could discourage well meaning and well qualified people from running and holding office.

Former Mayor Hardison noted that the Daily Breeze had supported keeping elections local in 1999 and she quoted from a 1999 editorial: "It follows that the more expensive local campaigns become, the more influence special interest money could have over election results." She stated that once in awhile a bad idea comes from good people and that this is a very bad idea.

Mayor Walker stated that the focus should be on the issue, not him. He stated again that if there is a consolidated election there are twice as many people voting and it costs half the amount. To talk about special influence and other things is to impugn the people who sit on the Council as everyone was elected in a consolidated election. Two members who were elected in 2002 had finished 10th and 11th in previous races, kept working, spent small amounts of money and won.

Mayor Walker asserted that government is improved with participation noting that people might want to make the smallest focus and group possible, but that is not the way government should work. He felt that government should not be made difficult for the people and reported that former Councilmember O'Donnell, who is currently president of the school board and a former school teacher, said that residents who normally don't make a special trip to the polls in municipal elections, get involved in a combined election. People get involved and are more interested during election time.

Former councilmember Mark Wirth, Marjorie Avenue, noted that this was an issue he had much experience with and he asserted that the combined city and state elections was a bad idea. He has opposed the issue in the past and still does because when the election is a combined election there is a higher voter turnout which requires that more money be spent by the candidates where they have to ask for more contributions to reach more voters. If a candidate can spend less that means they have to raise less which is an important point.

Mr. Wirth suggested one way to save the citizens money would be to consolidate municipal elections with school board elections in November of the odd years. He observed that people who vote in school board elections are obviously interested in the issues and he noted that there are certain cases when higher voter turnout is a good idea but it is not just the percentage of turnout that is important, but also it is the quality, interest and knowledge of the voters that is important. Many of the voters that vote in consolidated elections are not aware of City issues and that favors incumbents. If municipal elections were consolidated with school board elections there would be a community of interest

with people who are interested in the schools and the City coming out to vote. Those people who vote in larger elections can always come and vote for local elections but people who come and vote in municipal elections are interested in the issues. He related that in 1982 when they had a stand alone election it took \$6,000, mostly of his own money, to get elected and there is no way anyone could spend that money now and get elected.

Tom Brewer, Evalyn Avenue, noted that the March 2006 election would stay a consolidated election and with only a 50-50 chance that there will be action on SB1730 it does not make sense to spend \$120,000 to keep the election on the same date in 2006 when that money could be better spent on police and fire services or to repair the City's infrastructure. He questioned how much money would actually be saved noting that in 1998 the stand alone election with six open offices cost \$92,000. In the consolidated election of 2002, \$83,000 was spent with Torrance saving \$9,000. It will cost at least \$90,000 to put the measure before the voters and would take 10 elections or 20 years to make up that cost.

Mr. Brewer asserted that in a consolidated election, Torrance issues take a back seat to national and state issues with residents asking Council candidates what party they belong to and about their positions on bond measures. He stated that Torrance candidates should talk to the voters about Torrance issues and reported that on October 31, 1999 the Daily Breeze endorsed the idea of Torrance keeping standalone elections.

Mr. Brewer reported that when he ran for City Council he didn't do very well with fundraising and he pointed out that all of the current Councilmembers had debt left over from their campaigns. In 2002 the Council voted to extend the time to pay off their debts because of how much it cost them to run in a consolidated election and they also tried to raise the campaign contribution limits but that issue was voted down. Mr. Brewer commented that fundraising opens the door to the influence of special interests groups as the Daily Breeze also reported in their 1999 article.

Mr. Brewer pointed out that when looking at election turnouts through the years, Torrance voters come out when there is a hotly contested race. In the analysis of SB1730, according to the author's office, California's experiment with a March primary has been an utter failure. The state primary linked to the presidential primary was originally moved to March to give California more clout in the presidential nominating process. Not only has that not occurred, the impact on state and local elections has been devastating. In the 2004 primary, California set a record for the lowest turn out ever for a presidential primary. In the 2002 primary California set a record for the lowest turnout ever in a primary election in our state's history.

Mr. Brewer observed that for the past few months two councilmembers had been lobbying for local control over building and land use issues and he asked that they please be consistent and do not consider allowing the state to control Torrance elections. Instead of consolidating elections with the state, he suggested they change the election to May so Torrance candidates talk about Torrance issues.

Mayor Walker asserted that math gets creative but if you add up figures you will find that consolidated elections add up to a 41% voter turn out in the 2000-2004 elections as compared to an average going back as late as 1978 of 18%.

Mayor Walker stated that when he walked the precincts he did not find that city issues took a back seat to state and federal issues during consolidated elections. He

commented on the 1999 Daily Breeze support of Measure H to spend \$90,000 to move elections to May to have a smaller election that cost more money and quoted an article that read: "County run vote applauded. First such balloting for Torrance had excellent turnout and it saved money. The election fears of Torrance political insiders fell flat last week. Tuesday's Torrance municipal election run by Los Angeles County for the first time in the state's 79 year history didn't cost more money, attract uninformed voters or curtail the base as politicals had predicted." He asserted that the idea is to save the Torrance taxpayer money and increase turnout and he noted that City Clerk Herbers had budgeted \$215,000 for the 2000 election, it cost \$57,000 and there is a lot of cost savings in that.

Alan Lee, AFSCME Local 1117, supported consolidated elections noting that the issue impacts the people he represents who support increased voter turnout. He attributed opposition to the proposed measure to failed candidates and future candidates. He indicated his displeasure with people taking sides too early in the process. He felt the issue was not about who raised the most money but who had the best message and he gave credit to the voters who understand the issues. He stated that it was not an issue about candidates but the taxpayer.

Councilmember Witkowsky reported looking at three specific elections noting that 1994 was a standalone election in which she ran and lost and there were eleven Council candidates and three for City Clerk. She ran again and won in 2000 when there was a consolidated election with 13 candidates and one write in and noted that in 2002 there was a consolidated election with eight candidates. She asserted that the supposition that consolidated elections would limit the number that can run is not supported by the actual data in front of her.

Councilmember Nowatka corrected a statement made by Tom Brewer pointing out that he did not have campaign debt at the end and he added that he hoped they would not get into a process of rebutting each speaker.

David Henseler, Singingwood Drive, stated his belief that councilmembers were elected to represent residents who are present to provide their opinion on what they want. He reported being present two weeks ago when a widow on social security came before the Council to ask that the City remove a tree that the City had planted on a City easement that was about to destroy her main sewer line that she could not afford to fix. Mayor Walker had commented at that time that sometimes the City had to just say no. He pointed out this came right after the City Council had to approve a reimbursement of \$1,100 to the Mills Corporation for a trip that the Mayor took to see them and he suggested that the Mayor should have told the Mills Corporation that 'sometimes you just have to say no'. Mr. Henseler further commented that everyone who has gotten up to speak has received a rebuttal which he felt was inappropriate as this is the time for people to be heard and not rebutted.

Mayor Walker reported that the lady referred to from the previous meeting was contacted by him the next day and they did solve her problem. He also reported traveling to Virginia to meet with the Mills Corporation to tell them that they had no alternatives and they should have listened to the community in the beginning rather than taking the process through. Mayor Walker informed the president of the Mills Development Division that he had lost \$32 million by taking the actions that he had and he did not think that he would have traveled to Torrance to get that message. Mayor Walker was then advised by the City Attorney's office that the trip should be compensated and repaid in the manner it was handled.

Judy Weber, Border Avenue, thanked the Mayor for giving the public credit for paying attention to the issues on the ballot but she agreed with Councilmember Nowatka in terms of the possibility of checking a box because you have seen a sign on the road. She admitted to being guilty of that in the past and noted that a lot of people going to a combined election do that. Ms. Weber supported the idea of combining municipal elections with school board elections as those who would turn out would be concerned with the community.

Steve Busch, a resident of New Horizons for the past 26 years, noted that SB1730 had been passed by Democrats and Republicans alike with a vote of 38-0 and he believed there was an excellent chance it would pass the Assembly. He noted that in 2002 Senator Johnson sponsored SB1975 that moved the election to a June primary vetoed by the previous Governor. In 1998 Senator Costas' SB1999 was passed to move the primary to March elections on even number years, and after that in 1999 Prop H came forward.

He expressed support for the charter amendment noting that when he first ran for the school board it was a special election with a 7% turnout. In the next election there was a Gann proposition which fell in November at the same time as the scheduled school board election with a higher turn out of 40% where he received 13,000 votes. He had to campaign harder but was able to reach more voters. Mr. Busch found it alarming that some of the arguments made had been used in the past to go to support council districts and he supported the Torrance tradition of citywide elections as they all participate noting that combining the school board elections and municipal elections with the state elections would provide further cost savings and increased voter turnout.

Bill Sutherland, El Prado, indicating that he was failed city council candidate as was Mr. Lee, supported keeping municipal elections separate. He stated that he had lived in Torrance for 28 years and noted that in the past he had not always agreed but had felt pride at the actions of the Council but for the last couple of years his opinion of the Council had been fading as it seems that members are out for their own interests and that the more money you have, the easier it is to get elected.

Pat Furey, Cranbrook Avenue, quoted from the Mayor's letter in the Daily Breeze, "let's stop this attempt to keep voter turnout low" and commented that the agenda item was an attempt to change a 30 year history of March elections in the City of Torrance. He stated that he had moderated candidate forums for his homeowner association where each of them had appeared and heard him express his pride at the constitution of the United States and the six amendments that address voting rights. He pointed out that Measure H in 1999 gave the message that voters in Torrance want the elections to be in March and no other time, as it has been since 1974. What occurred in the 90s was the bi-annual primary elections coordinated with Torrance for four years with the legislation now wanting to go back to where they had been previously. According to documentation from the measure before the Assembly they are not happy and want to go back to June and it is a partisan, political issue that has nothing to do with the Torrance City Council.

Mr. Furey asserted that the \$120,000 cost of a special election to tie our election to somebody else's and give them control is money that could be better spent on police, fire protection or for parks and recreation programs. He indicated that he was not one of the same people who wanted a stand alone election in May, but rather is one of the people who demands that the City does not use its funds now to possibly change the date of our

election in the future. He added that according to the County of Los Angeles Registrar Recorder, there are 50 cities in the County of Los Angeles who have stand alone elections in odd years. They do not rely on a primary election or general election; they have their own election just as Torrance has for 30 years. Mr. Furey respectfully asked that the Council table the issue.

Marsha Cribbs, Johnson Court, urged the council to vote no on the change of election. She noted in the past that the Council had been critical of the legislature trying to interfere with local land issues and she expressed support for that questioning why the Council would want them to interfere with local elections. She directed the Council to look on page 7 of the pink supplemental and noted that a number of those items are annotated so they are not exactly what they seem. 54% of the voting turnout was for the top of the ticket, it did not represent those who voted for councilmembers.

Ms. Cribbs expressed interest in the Orals of July 20 when Councilmember Nowatka asked for the date when this item was to be considered so that he could attend the meeting and Mayor Walker's response was: "The votes are such it would have to be a positive vote. If were you inclined to vote no I don't believe it may make a difference in the outcome." She questioned whether that statement was a violation of the Brown Act or an attempt to build a consensus on the item before it ever came before the public and expressed hope that councilmembers would keep an open mind and listen to the people present.

Ms. Cribbs indicated that local elections are important and they want participation in terms of candidates and voters noting that it is hard for candidates to run in a combined election as it is difficult to raise money at that level and you have to go to unions, developers and those who do business with the City. If the election is run in March by the City the costs for candidates go down a lot and many people who run put in their own money though no one wants to. She indicated that she would like to see the City be independent of special interests and have elections by themselves.

Ms. Cribbs observed that Mayor Walker had no problem with the issue of the future conflict in 2016 when he supported the fact that they should keep the election in March last time and stated that if the Assembly and Senate change the election to June it won't be an issue.

Ms. Cribbs pointed out that if you look at the pink sheet there is really no cost savings and there is a significant drop out of votes from the top vs. the bottom of the ballot and though it is not clear why ballots are not fully filled out, one theory is voter fatigue.

Ms. Cribbs recommended voting no on changing the election and was curious as to whether campaign limitations would be dropped if the election was moved to June based on the argument that it would be necessary because it was more expensive to run in a combined election. She noted that when walking precincts in a combined election you are asked what party you belong to and if there is a controversial proposition on the ballot you will be defined by that issue even though local officials have no impact on national issues.

Robert Thompson, President, Madrona Homeowners Association supported local control over the elections and asked that the City Charter not be amended. He encouraged the Council to take this opportunity to reinstate the City's faith in their representatives.

Jackie Decker, Carlow Road, expressed opposition to the issue noting that the current system has worked for 30 years, the Council needs to stay focused and this is another night that residents have to be present at a Council meeting to make sure that the Council is listening to the citizens.

Dick Rossberg, Via Malaga, Redondo Beach, appreciated previous comments but did not like hearing the criticism of this council as he felt this was one of the best councils he had seen in 40 years with honest, open and conscientious councilmembers. He supported consolidated elections as he felt that bringing out the most voters is a positive spin as it will make them more involved.

Donald Powelson, Earl Street, stated that he was a responsible voter and expressed support for combining elections as it is harder for people to make it to the polls on several occasions.

Councilmember Scotto argued some of the numbers noting that the last three elections averaged a 35% turnout if you included all the consolidated elections. He noted that there had been a reduction in candidates pointing out that in 1994 there were 11 candidates in the stand alone election, there were 13 candidates in the consolidated election of 2000, and 8 in the consolidated election of 2002. He reiterated that he did not see why the action is necessary now as the issue will not arise until 2016 and he felt it was a waste of money and makes it hard to give raises to employees when this type of money is spent.

In response to an inquiry from Councilmember Lieu, City Clerk Herbers indicated that she would budget \$120,000 for a stand alone election. Councilmember Lieu appreciated comments from the public but felt that though he is for consolidated elections he did not feel it was his decision to make. He asserted that the decision should be left to the voters and residents of Torrance and he clarified that tonight they were voting on who should decide that issue, the Council or voters and residents.

Councilmember Lieu indicated that a yes vote on the agenda item sends the issue to the voters in Torrance where as a No vote takes that issue away from them. He reiterated that the voters of Torrance had rejected stand alone elections in 1999 with Measure H which approved consolidated elections and felt that it was the responsibility of voters, not the Council to reverse that if they chose to do so.

Councilmember McIntyre supported Councilmember Lieu's comments and noted that it had been an issue for a very long period of time in Torrance and by failing to make a decision things have been allowed to fester creating two camps in Torrance. People in Torrance want to retain the unique qualities of the City and she felt the decision was up to the voters. She supported spending the money to put the issue on the ballot to once and for all resolve a long festering issue in the community.

Councilmember Nowatka pointed out that the issue was brought to the Council from an anonymous councilmember, not from the citizens of Torrance and it was the responsibility of the council whether or not to support that request. He reiterated that they don't even know who it is who is trying to initiate a change to the election, but it did not come from the citizens. If it had come from the citizens then it would be the responsibility of the voters to make that decision. He asserted that the decision is whether to spend \$120,000 to support somebody's idea and they don't even know whose idea it is. He

disagreed with Councilmember McIntyre asserting that it was their responsibility to vote on it because it originated from the council.

Councilmember Witkowsky apologized for her rebuttal during public comment noting that she did not mean to be disrespectful. She took the comment to heart that councilmembers were only doing this to get reelected noting that there are term limits and she is a lame duck and will not be running for office.

Councilmember Witkowsky concurred with colleagues Lieu and McIntyre and expressed support for letting the item go to the vote of the people noting that while she was not the one who asked that the issue be brought forth it is something that is out there and a decision that they do have to make. She reported being astounded by figures in the articles and reports indicating that with consolidated elections there were still lots of people who ran for office.

of the most sacred things a democracy has is the act of voting and he expressed discomfort with telling the voters of Torrance how to vote.

City Clerk Herbers pointed out that unless they change the measure as it is currently proposed, if the election does not change to June they will continue to have consolidated elections in March. She noted they were not really making a choice between a stand alone and/or a consolidated election at this point. Mayor Walker indicated that the City Attorney had drafted it just as he had been asked to.

Mayor Walker commented that if this had not been mentioned to him by several people he would have brought it forward anyway as it is a decision for the people of Torrance to make. The decision was made once before in 1999 and it was interesting to listen to the history of it this evening. The people of Torrance will make a wise decision and they will abide by whichever way they vote, but they will have the opportunity of determining that.

MOTION: Councilmember Lieu moved to concur with the staff recommendation. Councilmember Mauno seconded the motion and a roll call vote indicated the following: Councilmembers Lieu, Mauno, McIntyre and Witkowsky and Mayor Walker voted YES. Councilmembers Nowatka and Scotto voted NO. Motion Passed.

At 7:53 p.m. Mayor Walker called a brief recess until 8:07 p.m.

City Clerk Herbers explained the resolutions before the Council: the first resolution is to call the general election, the second to consolidate the election, the third to set the priorities for filing written arguments regarding the measure with a choice of someone specifically writing it. The California Elections Code Section 9282 states that the legislative body or any member or members of the legislative body, authorized by that body or any individual voter who is eligible to vote on the measure or bona fide association or citizens or any combination of voters or associations may file written argument for or against any measure. She indicated that if it was acceptable to the council that anyone can file the measures then they don't need to take action on the third resolution which is Attachment C. Arguments will then be received in the order she specified in the elections code section. If the council wishes to reserve arguments to the City Council they can do that by adopting Attachment C and which would allow the council to call for who they would like to have the arguments.

Councilmember Nowatka clarified that Attachment C would restrict the argument to the City Council and City Clerk Herbers indicated that D would allow rebuttals but they currently have no resolution on file to allow rebuttals to any argument. In order to allow rebuttals they would need to adopt the last resolution.

Mayor Walker indicated that in fairness to both sides, arguments for and against would need to be allowed. Arguments would be drafted by members of the council on either side of the issue and then members of the community could be added to that list if they so choose.

Councilmember Scotto received clarification from City Clerk Herbers that they would have to accept Attachment D to give the community the right to make rebuttals also.

Councilmember Witkowski noted that because of the vote of the Council on this matter that would mean that there would be a big split in terms of the pro and con rebuttal that would leave two people who could do the rebuttal.

City Attorney Fellows tried to clarify that there were two issues: one of them is does the Council want to make a decision about who is going to write the arguments for and against the measure. They can leave the matter alone in which case the election code establishes a priority or they can make the decision to direct it amongst themselves. Separate from that is the question of whether to allow rebuttal arguments. They can designate members of the Council to write on each side or not, but rebuttals will not be allowed. Or they can say they are not going to direct anyone in particular on the Council but rebuttals will be allowed and then there is an order that the elections officials select from when people draft arguments and submit them.

City Clerk Herbers noted that if more than one argument in favor or more than one argument against the measure is submitted within the time prescribed, the City Clerk shall select one of the arguments in favor and one of the arguments against for printing and distribution. Preference and priority will be given in the order named to the arguments from members of the legislative body or individual voters, or bona fide association of citizens or combination of voters or citizens, or any other individual voters who are eligible to vote.

Councilmember Nowatka stated that he would vote against the first two resolutions for consistency but wanted to ensure the widest available opportunity for arguments to be written and would vote to allow rebuttals.

City Clerk Herbers clarified that in order to allow the widest available opportunity for anyone to write an argument she suggested not voting on Attachment C which calls for specific individuals on the Council to write. Should any member of the Council choose to write arguments for or against it would be considered in order.

Mayor Walker commented that it would wind up that there were arguments written on both sides by either Councilmembers or members of the public and Councilmember Nowatka wanted to make sure they did not eliminate the possibility of the public providing input.

Councilmember Scotto clarified that voting no on C and yes on D would give the public the right to submit arguments and City Clerk Herbers indicated that it would still be done on a priority basis.

Mayor Walker observed that the process was no less complicated than it was for Measure H.

In response to an inquiry from Councilmember Mauno, City Clerk Herbers explained that if no action were taken on Attachment C, the City Council will be considered first or any members of the legislative body and individual voters. She makes the decision but the elections code calls out the priority. If no member of the Council submits any arguments for or against then she goes to the voters. All information must be sent to the County Registrar no later than August 16 but she would like to see them in her office earlier than that to check for proper wording and make sure all signatures are in place.

City Attorney Fellows indicated that he did not clearly understand the filing deadlines noting that on page 4 of the staff report there is a schedule indicating that the last day to file arguments is Monday, August 16 but then there is a 10 day review period which gives people an opportunity to challenge any arguments submitted with a deadline of Thursday, August 26 as the last day to file rebuttal arguments. He felt the way the general period works there is usually a 14 day period for people who want to write arguments either for or against and then 10 day review period during which rebuttal arguments are written but he was not clear what the deadline was to get it to the County Registrar.

City Clerk Herbers reported that those were the dates provided to her by the County Registrar's Office. In this time period the arguments can be filed and they are available for a 10 day review period to review what others have written should anyone choose to come forward and challenge what had been written. The 10 day review period ends on August 26 and all information would be shared back and forth with anyone who filed the arguments or who files a rebuttal so that they can look upon and act upon the information which will be available on the public counter and on the website. August 26 is last day to file a rebuttal to original arguments with another 10 review period for rebuttals ending on September 7 which is extended because of the holiday.

Mayor Walker indicated that there would be the opportunity for the maximum amount of participation in the matter and the City Clerk will abide by the priority established under the elections code.

Councilmember Mauno pointed out a scrivener's error on the schedule which will be corrected.

RESOLUTION NO. 2004-97

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA CALLING AND GIVING NOTICE OF THE HOLDING OF A SPECIAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2004 FOR THE SUBMISSION OF A PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT.

MOTION: Councilmember Mauno moved to adopt Resolution No. 2004-97. Councilmember Witkowsky seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected the following: Councilmembers Lieu, Mauno, McIntyre, and Witkowsky and Mayor Walker voting YES. Councilmembers Nowatka and Scotto voting NO. MOTION PASSED.

RESOLUTION NO. 2004-98

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA REQUESTING THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES TO CONSOLIDATE A SPECIAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 2, 2004, WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON THE DATE PURUANT TO §10403 OF THE ELECTIONS CODE.

MOTION: Councilmember Mauno moved to adopt Resolution No. 2004-98. Councilmember Witkowsky seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected the following: Councilmembers Lieu, Mauno, McIntyre, and Witkowsky and Mayor Walker voting YES. Councilmembers Nowatka and Scotto voting NO. MOTION PASSED.

City Clerk Herbers indicated that she would be changing the title to statewide general election and further noted that Resolution 2004-99 was an optional resolution if they chose to allow rebuttals.

RESOLUTION NO. 2004-99

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA PROVIDING FOR THE FILING OF REBUTTAL ARGUMENTS FOR CITY MEASURES SUBMITTED AT MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.

MOTION: Councilmember Mauno moved to adopt Resolution No. 2004-99. Councilmember Witkowsky seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval.

City Attorney Fellows pointed out that at present they had not authorized members of the Council to file arguments either for or against and he expressed concern that would endanger Council priority in the event that someone did want to write an argument. He indicated that they did not have to designate people, but could adopt Attachment C to authorize them so Councilmembers will have priority over the public noting if they did not do that they would not necessarily have that priority.

City Attorney Fellows suggested that they direct the City Clerk to change portions of Section 1 to read: "...that the City Council authorizes members of the City Council to file a written argument in favor or against." He clarified that they did not have to designate specific members of the Council, all they would be doing is authorizing any members who wish to prepare an argument to do so and to have priority in terms of that argument.

Councilmember Nowatka received clarification that those members who choose to do so would have their names appear on that argument and Councilmember Scotto noted that would not preclude someone from the community from doing the same.

Councilmember McIntyre felt this was an important right for the City Council to retain.

RESOLUTION NO. 2004-100

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA SETTING PRIORITIES FOR FILING A WRITTEN ARGUMENT REGARDING A CITY MEASURE AND DIRECTING THE CITY ATTORNEY TO PREPARE AN IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS.

MOTION: Councilmember Mauno moved to adopt Resolution No. 2004-100. Councilmember Witkowsky seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval.

*

The Torrance Redevelopment Agency met from 8 26 p.m. to 8:27 p.m.

*

16. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

16a. Councilmember Lieu reported that the son of City Employee Ian Tanza had recently returned from Iraq and may be deployed again soon and he commended Mr. Tanza noting that was difficult.

16b. Councilmember Lieu stated that Nina McCorry was collecting care packages for Raimie McCorry who was scheduled to deploy to Iraq on August 19 and she could be contacted at (310) 618-0720.

16c. Councilmember Lieu reported attending an event at the Los Angeles Air Force Base for their 50th Anniversary celebration with speeches by Supervisor Don Knabe, Councilwoman Jane Harmon, General Arnold of the Air Force Base and several others. He commented that the base was a crown jewel for the South Bay providing over 60,000 jobs and billions of dollars worth of contracts and he noted they were fighting hard to keep the base here in the South Bay and protect it from the next round of base closures in 2005. He added that Mayor Walker was there to present a Resolution on behalf of the City.

16d. Councilmember Lieu reported debris at Torrance and Anza in front of Pavilions and asked staff to ensure that it is cleaned up.

16e. Councilmember Mauno thanked Fire Chief Bongard for granting him the privilege of checking in with Battalion C under Chief William Rachowski at Fire Station 1 and he was very impressed with the teamwork of the department. He indicated that Torrance is one of very few Fire Departments in the country with a Class One Fire Department designation and he shared some of his experiences while there.

16f. Councilmember McIntyre indicated that Madrona Marsh is one of the greatest treasures of the City and she encouraged residents to visit the nature preserve. Staff and volunteers have been working since the 70s to create a nature preserve in the midst of a very industrial City and Senator Barbara Boxer recently presented the Marsh with a Conservative Champion Award which she gives out annually to organizations who preserve the environment.

16g. Mayor Walker commended Mark Wirth on his hard work at the Madrona Marsh.

16h. Councilmember Nowatka joined in the commendation for Madrona Marsh and congratulated them on receiving the award.

16i. Councilmember Nowatka encouraged everyone to go see the Sound of Music at the Armstrong Theatre.

16j. Responding to Councilmember Witkowsky's question about flaring at Exxon/Mobil Fire Chief Bongard stated that during June equipment was replaced and rerouted resulting

in additional flaring over the past month. He explained that flaring is a way to alleviate small problems and an important part of the process so if there was no flaring then there would be a problem. He noted that Exxon/Mobil had sent out mailers and "Freddie the Flare" was run on cable TV to explain why the refinery is flaring and it would be run again on a quarterly basis.

16k. Councilmember Witkowsky reported seeing cars with smashed windows in several parts of Torrance, noting that in separate instances people had items on the front seat of their car. She cautioned residents not to leave anything of value in view on the seats of their cars and Police Chief Herren noted that there are always random things that occur but he was not aware of a pattern developing.

16l. Mayor Walker noted that tomorrow was the first Wednesday of the month and he encouraged people to stop by as he is starting a Mayor's Open House. He will be in his office at City Hall for the entire day and open to talk to anybody about any subject without an appointment.

16m. Mayor Walker expressed pride toward the Council noting that though they may be divided on several important issues, the matters were always handled civilly.

16n. City Clerk Herbers announced that vacancies on the Library and Water Commissions would be filled by the City Council at the meeting of August 10 and she noted that applications were available online at www.tornet.com and at the City Clerk's office with additional information available by calling (310) 618-2870.

16o. City Clerk Herbers invited staff and the public to view the watercolors of Torrance Artist Guild member Virginia Trimble on display in the City Clerk's office through the end of August.

16q. Bonnie Mae Barnard, Gramercy, expressed frustration that supplementals are not available prior to the meeting and it is hard to skim data provided to the public only moments before a Council meeting. In addition she noted that often there are not enough copies of the supplemental available for everyone attending. She also requested consideration of making Planning Commission meetings available to the public on City Cable like Council meetings are. Lastly Ms. Barnard addressed a matter of etiquette, commenting that it was very intimidating to speak in front of the Council and it is difficult to be interrupted and have everything said be negated by Mayor Walker who repeatedly provided responses to those he disagreed with.

16r. City Clerk Herbers indicated that it is hard for the City Clerk's office to know how many people will be attending the meetings and estimate the proper number of supplementals to make. She added that supplemental material is usually information that comes in at the last minute and is not available early, but she encouraged downloading of agendas from the website and noted that if people want additional information they can call the clerk's office. Ms. Barnard suggested adding the materials to the website so she can print them at her own expense.

16s. Pete Fraley, Nadine Circle, spoke as a resident and City employee reporting that they had just entered into employee negotiations regarding concerns with retirement benefits amidst difficult times and he urged Councilmembers to continue to work with the local union to soften the impact on the cost of their benefits.

16t. Sandy Raysik, Cranbrook Avenue, a resident for 36 years and a part time employee on a continuous basis with no breaks for 25 years, reported that she had been denied basic benefits and asked the Council to direct management to treat part time workers like everyone else and evaluate the substandard benefits they receive.

16u. Theresa Babiar, Camino Real, Redondo Beach, a 10-year city employee asked the Council to consider allowing library pages to purchase insurance at their own cost through the City. She indicated that library pages are currently considered temporary recurrent employees. She introduced Diana Calhoun, a library page for 20 years and reported supervising three library pages some of whom are forced to consider employment outside of the City because they need medical benefits. Ms. Babiar asked the Council to recognize these loyal employees who would like to buy into the City plan at their own cost.

16v. Charles Deemer, Talisman, inquired about the search for a permanent place for Torrance Transit and Assistant City Manager Sunshine reported that staff had been working with the transit facility administration on a distribution plan for the transit facility and information on that will be brought back at a later date.

16w. Kenny Evans, Emerald Street, a 28-year resident of the City and City employee for 23 years asked the Council and Mayor to please support efforts to improve retirement, medical and deferred compensation plans.

16x. Nancy Severtson, West 179th Street, spoke as a resident and a retiree of AFSCME Local 809, reporting that she was working with Alan Lee to help the AFSCME 1117 better their benefits and hopefully save the City of Torrance money. She expressed the desire to help the City of Torrance to get the best benefits around for the same cost or less noting that retirees need life insurance that they can continue when they retire. Mayor Walker invited Ms. Severtson to attend his open house tomorrow to discuss the matter further.

16y. Donald Powelson, Earl Street, a long time resident, City employee and union representative, thanked Councilmembers for their hard work and dedication to the City especially with the state issues that have come up. He asked for enhanced retirement benefits that would allow employees to protect their financial future noting that the current life insurance benefit was \$35,000 with poor coverage. Mr. Powelson felt they could find more coverage for the same price and he noted that long term and short term disability policies could also be improved. He observed a feeling among some employees that they are second class citizens as opposed to fire and police employees and their concerns have been given less priority. He cited attempts by the union to correct inadequacies and noted that the members of Local 1117 wanted to know that the future they have built would be safeguarded by the right benefit package.

16z. Alan Lee, AFSCME Local 1117, thanked City employees who were present at the meeting for their support and echoed comments that employees feel like second class citizens not just compared to fire and police employees but also to managers. He noted that not long ago the Council gave management a 3.8% package and he would like to see the same consideration for other employees. Mr. Lee felt that the City had a moral obligation to purchase medical insurance after someone has given over two decades of service to the City and cited the issue of recurrent employees which is the term the city uses for permanent part time employees who are not deemed eligible to receive benefits. He noted that some members had been recently put into the retirement system but he questioned how the previous years were to be accounted for pointing out that people are dying before the City can get life insurance improved. Mr. Lee indicated he would speak to the Mayor at his open house and expressed hope that they could work together toward better retirement and better medical coverage.

17. EXECUTIVE SESSION

Considered earlier in the meeting.

18. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:17 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Tuesday, August 10, 2004 at 5:30 p.m., for an executive session, with the regular meeting commencing at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers.

Attest:

/s/ Dan Walker

Mayor of the City of Torrance

/s/ Sue Herbers

Sue Herbers, CMC
City Clerk of the City of Torrance

Approved on September 14, 2004

Kristi Callan
Recording Secretary

